REMARKS

In the August 3, 2007 Office Action, the specification (title of the invention) was objected to and claims 1-10 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the August 3, 2007 Office Action, Applicants have amended the title of the invention and independent claim 1 as indicated above. Thus, claims 1-10 are pending, with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Specification / Title of Invention

In the numbered paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the title of the invention is objected to as being too generic to be descriptive.

In response, Applicants have amended the title of the invention as indicated above. Applicants believe the amended title is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the numbered paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,073,667 to Graffin (hereinafter "Graffin patent") in view of "How Real Electric Motors Work: 1. Induction Motors", *Physics Resources for Teachers and Students,* John Story, University of New South Wales, School of Physics, Sydney, Australia (hereinafter "Non-Patent Reference 1"), "Induction Motors", *Hyper-Physics: Electricity and Mechanism*, C.R. Nave, Georgia State University, Department of Physics and Astronomy (hereinafter "Non-Patent Reference 2"), and "Basic AC/DC Power Supplies" (hereinafter "Non-Patent Reference 3"). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 as indicated above.

More specifically, independent claim 1 now clearly recites that the power supply mechanism is further configured to ***transmit a signal*** indicative of a weight data of the object weighed by the weighing member ***between the secondary coil and the primary coil in a non-contact manner***. Applicants believe such amendment is supported at least by Figure 16 and

lines 3-15 on page 13 of the present application. According to the invention recited in claim 1, since the signal indicative of the weight data of the object weighed by the weighing member is transmitted between the secondary coil and the primary coil in a non-contact manner, problems such as tangle of wires can be prevented from occurring.

Clearly this arrangement is ***not*** disclosed or suggested by the Graffin patent, the Non-Patent References 1-3 or any other prior art of record.

The Graffin patent fails to disclose a power supply mechanism for supplying power to the weighing member. Therefore, the Graffin patent is silent about the power supply mechanism that is also configured to ***transmit a signal*** indicative of a weight data of the object weighed by the weighing member ***between the secondary coil and the primary coil in a non-contact manner*** as now recited in independent claim 1.

The secondary references, i.e., the Non-Patent References 1-3, are apparently cited in order to show structures of a conventional induction motor and a conventional AC/DC power supply circuit. However, the Non-Patent References 1-3 fail to provide for the deficiencies of the Graffin patent with respect to the limitations now recited in independent claim 1. More specifically, ***none*** of the Non-Patent References 1-3 discloses or suggests that the power supply mechanism, which is configured to supply power to the weighing member, is also configured to ***transmit a signal*** indicative of a weight data of the object weighed by the weighing member ***between the secondary coil and the primary coil in a non-contact manner*** as now recited in independent claim 1.

It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does ***not*** make the modification obvious, unless the prior art provides an ***apparent reason*** for the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any apparent reason, suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement of the weighing device.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claims 2-10 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 2-10 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, the

prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-10 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Nomugi Tomoyori /
Nomugi Tomoyori
Reg. No. 59,784

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: October 19, 2007

S:\10-OCT07-NT\IS-US030671 Amendment.doc